## CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Sunerior Court

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney, SBN 111529 FEB 22 2018
MARY CLARE MOLIDOR, Chief, Criminal & Special Lit. Branch, SBN 82404
JONATHAN CRISTALL, Supervising Assistant City Attorney, SBN 191935 1 2 RAHI AZIZI, Deputy City Attorney, SBN 274800 200 North Main Street, Room 966 By Shaunya Bolden, Deputy 3 Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 978-4090 (213) 978-8717 4 Telephone: Fax: 5 E-Mail: Rahi.Azizi@lacity.org 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff NO FEE - GOV'T CODE § 6103 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT 10 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. Case No.: 11 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR ABATEMENT 12 AND INJUNCTION VS. 13 [HEALTH & SAFETY CODE MARIA LUISA LLAMAS, an individual; and DOES 1) SECTION 11570, ET SEQ.; CIVIL 14 through 50, inclusive, CODE SECTION 3479, ET SEQ.] 15 Defendants. [Unlimited Action] 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR ABATEMENT AND INJUNCTION

## 4 5 6

# 7

### 10 11

12

## 13

14

## 15

### 16 17

## 18

## 19

#### 20 21

## 22

### 23

## 2425

#### 26

### 27

#### 28

#### PLAINTIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, alleges as follows:

#### . INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff, the People of the State of California (the "People"), brings this action ("Action") to abate and enjoin a narcotics-related public nuisance that exists at a ten-unit apartment complex (hereinafter, the "Complex" or "Property") located in the City of Los Angeles at 823 and 825 W. 82nd Street. The Complex has been a gang-controlled hub for narcotics sales since 2012 and remains so to this day. This Action, which is brought pursuant to the Narcotics Abatement Law ("NAL"), California Health and Safety Code section 11570, et seq., and the Public Nuisance Law ("PNL"), California Civil Code sections 3479 and 3480, seeks to put an end to the ongoing narcotics and nuisance activity at the Complex.
- 2. Between February 2017 and February 2018, Los Angeles Police Department ("LAPD") officers executed six search warrants at the Complex on six different dates. Upon executing all six of the warrants, including the most recent one in February 2018 (which was executed just one week before the filing of this Complaint), officers recovered various quantities of narcotics, including cocaine base (rock), methamphetamine, and/or MDMA (commonly known as ecstasy), scales, baggies, and U.S. currency from the Complex. Officers also recovered a semi-automatic handgun, a revolver, and ammunition while executing one of the warrants, and additional ammunition on another occasion while conducting a subsequent investigation. While executing the February 2018 warrant, officers recovered a high-capacity semi-automatic Beretta (capable of holding 18 rounds) from a one-bedroom unit occupied by an infant and a small child. During this same one-year period, LAPD officers also conducted eight controlled "buy-bust" operations—wherein an informant successfully purchased narcotics from dealers at the Complex at least once prior to LAPD's execution of each of the six search warrants—and made ten arrests for narcotics sales at the Complex. Despite this effort by LAPD to investigate and disrupt the narcotics activity, the Property remains a one-stop drug shop at which narcotics are continually bought, sold, and stored. Significantly, either all or almost all of the dealers who have been arrested at the Property for narcotics sales are associates or members of the notorious Hoover Crips criminal street gang. These gang

members or associates use the Property to store and sell narcotics and engage in other illegal acts, and at least some—if not all—of the drug dealers who have been arrested for selling narcotics at the Property reside at the Complex. In November 2017, while officers were executing one of the aforementioned warrants, a suspect at the Property forced his way into the unit of a nearby apartment through the rear sliding door and terrified the tenant living there as the suspect attempted to hide from the officers. The suspect was subsequently found and charged with violating Health and Safety Code section 11353 (using a minor to sell a controlled substance).

- 3. The Complex is located on the north side of 82nd Street, just west of Hoover Street, and as stated, is comprised of ten units. Drug dealers at the Complex use the units and the common areas to sell and/or store narcotics. The Complex is known within the community as a place where narcotics are bought and sold. As a result of this reputation, the Complex continues to attract individuals seeking to sell, buy, and use narcotics, despite repeated arrests and search warrants. Ironically, a handwritten sign posted at the Complex ostensibly warns occupants against drug use: "Drugs are illegal. Do not use in the property." The message is either a tongue-and-check invitation to narcotics users, left there by drug dealers to advertise the availability of drugs at the Property with a wink and a nod, or a futile gesture by the property owner that serves only to reinforce the prevalence of narcotics activity at the Property.
- 4. Additionally, the Property is a magnet for other nuisance-related incidents that occurred in 2017 and 2018 and continue to occur there on an ongoing basis, including the illegal possession of ammunition and firearms and assault with a deadly weapon. Moreover, the above-described activities have occurred and continue to occur dangerously close to the following schools and churches located within 2,000 feet of the Property:
  - a. Frederick K.C. Price III Christian Schools at 7901 S. Vermont Avenue,
     which is located within 1,258 feet of the Property.
  - b. Miller Elementary School at 830 W. 77th Street, which is located within 1,438 feet of the Property.

- c. Manchester Avenue Elementary School at 661 W. 87th Street, which is located within 1,635 feet of the Property.
- d. Bakewell Primary Center at 8621 S. Baring Cross Street, which is located within 1,699 feet of the Property.
- e. KIPP Academy of Opportunity at 8500 S. Figueroa Street, which is located within 1,861 feet of the Property.
- f. New Antioch Church of God at 7826 S. Vermont Avenue, which is located within 1,446 feet of the Property.
- g. Saint Rest Baptist Church at 709 W. Manchester Avenue, which is located within 1,536 feet of the Property.
- 5. Defendant Maria Luisa Llamas ("Defendant") has owned the Property since April 6, 1988, and continues to own it. Defendant is directly and/or indirectly permitting and facilitating drug sales, drug distribution, drug usage, and violent acts at the Property, and creating a public nuisance that disturbs the entire community and neighborhood. Defendant herself does not live at the Property.
- 6. This Action is intended to redress the unacceptable state of affairs at the Property and to halt the sale, distribution, and purchase of drugs there.

#### II. THE PARTIES AND THE PROPERTY

#### A. The Plaintiff

7. Plaintiff, the People, is the sovereign power of the State of California designated in California Health and Safety Code section 11571 and California Code of Civil Procedure section 731 to be the complaining party in actions brought to abate, enjoin, and penalize narcotics nuisances and public nuisances, respectively.

#### B. <u>The Defendant</u>

- 8. Defendant Maria Luisa Llamas owns the Property in her individual capacity and has owned it since April 6, 1988.
- 9. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious

 names. Each such defendant is responsible in some manner for conducting, maintaining, or directly or indirectly permitting the unlawful activities and acts complained of herein. When the true names and capacities of said defendants have been ascertained, Plaintiff will seek the Court's leave to amend this complaint and to insert in lieu of such fictitious names the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named defendants.

#### C. The Property

10. The Property is a ten-unit apartment complex located within the County and City of Los Angeles on West 82nd Street, just west of Hoover Avenue. The Property is comprised of the following addresses: (1) 823 W. 82nd Street; (2) 823 1/5 W. 82nd Street; (3) 823 2/5 W. 82nd Street; (4) 823 3/5 W. 82nd Street; (5) 823 4/5 W. 82nd Street; (6) 825 W. 82nd Street; (7) 825 1/5 W. 82nd Street; (8) 825 2/5 W. 82nd Street; (9) 825 3/5 W. 82nd Street; and (10) 825 W. 4/5 82nd Street, Los Angeles, California 90044. The legal description of the Property is: "Lot 242 of Sunnyside Park Addition, as per map recorded in Book 6 Page 198 of Maps, in the office of the county recorder of said county." The Assessor's Parcel Number for the Property is 6032-006-024.

#### III. THE NARCOTICS ABATEMENT LAW

- 11. The abatement of a nuisance is a long established and well-recognized exercise of the state's police power. (*People v. Barbiere* (1917) 33 Cal.App. 770, 775; *People ex rel. Hicks v. Sarong Gals* (1974) 42 Cal.App.3d 556, 563.) Since its enactment in 1972, the principal purpose of the NAL (Health & Saf. Code, § 11570, *et seq.*) is the abatement of buildings and places "used for the purpose of unlawfully selling, serving, storing, keeping, manufacturing, or giving away any controlled substance, precursor, or analog specified in this division . . . ." (Health & Saf. Code, § 11570.)
- 12. The NAL provides that every building or place used for the purpose of unlawfully selling, serving, storing, keeping, manufacturing, or giving away any controlled substance, precursor, or analog, *inter alia*, "is a nuisance which **shall** be enjoined, abated, and prevented . . whether it is a public or private nuisance." (Health & Saf. Code, § 11570 [emphasis added]; People ex rel Lungren v. Peron (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 1383, 1389; Lew v. Superior Court

(1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 866, 870-871.)

- 13. Health and Safety Code section 11571 authorizes a city attorney to bring an action to abate, prevent, and perpetually enjoin such nuisances. It provides in relevant part: "Whenever there is reason to believe that a nuisance as described in section 11570 is kept, maintained, or exists in any county, the district attorney of the county, or the city attorney of any incorporated city or of any city and county, in the name of the people, may . . . maintain an action to abate and prevent the nuisance and perpetually to enjoin the person conducting or maintaining it, and the owner, lessee, or agent of the building or place in or upon which the nuisance exists from directly or indirectly maintaining or permitting the nuisance."
- 14. Health and Safety Code section 11573(a) provides that: "If the existence of the nuisance is shown in the action to the satisfaction of the court or judge, either by verified complaint or affidavit, the court or judge *shall* allow a temporary restraining order or injunction to abate and prevent the continuance or recurrence of the nuisance." (Emphasis added.) In addition, Health and Safety Code section 11581 provides, as an additional remedy, for the removal and sale of all fixtures and movable property on the premises used in aiding or abetting the nuisance and for the closure of the building for up to one year.

#### IV. THE PUBLIC NUISANCE LAW

- 15. Civil Code section 3479 defines a public nuisance as "[a]nything which is injurious to health, including, but not limited to, the illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any . . . public park, square, street, or highway . . . ." (See City of Bakersfield v. Miller (1966) 64 Cal.2d 93, 99 ["The Legislature has defined in general terms the word 'nuisance' in Civil Code section 3479. . . . "].)
- 16. Civil Code section 3480 defines a public nuisance as "one which affects at the same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons, although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal."
  - 17. In particular, drug dealing, loitering, the consumption of alcohol and illegal drugs,

23

24

25

26

27

28

and boisterous conduct which creates a "hooligan-like atmosphere" constitutes a public nuisance. (People ex rel. Gallo v. Acuna (1997) 14 Cal.4th 1090, 1120.)

- 18. Civil Code section 3491 provides for the methods by which public nuisances such as those alleged herein may be abated. Civil Code section 3491 states that the "remedies against a public nuisance are indictment or information, a civil action or abatement." Abatement is "accomplished by a court of equity by means of an injunction proper and suitable to the facts of each case." (Sullivan v. Royer (1887) 72 Cal. 248, 249; see also People v. Selby Smelting and Lead Co. (1912) 163 Cal. 84, 90 ["[I]n California, the rule is well established that in proper cases injunctive relief which accomplishes the purposes of abatement without its harsh features is permissible"].)
- 19. Code of Civil Procedure section 731 authorizes a city attorney to bring an action to enjoin or abate a public nuisance. It provides in relevant part: "A civil action may be brought in the name of the people of the State of California to abate a public nuisance . . . by the city attorney of any town or city in which such nuisance exists."
- 20. Where "a building or other property is so used as to make it a nuisance under the statute, the nuisance may be abated . . . , notwithstanding that the owner had no knowledge that it was used for the unlawful purpose constituting a nuisance." (People ex rel. Bradford v. Barbiere (1917) 33 Cal.App.770, 779; see also Sturges v. Charles L. Harney, Inc. (1958) 165 Cal.App.2d 306, 318 ["a nuisance and liability therefore may exist without negligence"]; People v. McCadden (1920) 48 Cal.App. 790, 792 ["A judgment supported on findings that such nuisance was conducted and maintained on the premises in question, regardless of the knowledge of the owner thereof, is sufficient. Such knowledge on the part of the owner . . . is unnecessary"]; People v. Peterson (1920) 45 Cal.App.457, 460 ["[I]t was not necessary . . . for the trial court to find either, that the [defendants] threatened, and unless restrained, would continue to maintain, aid, and abet, the nuisance, or that they knew the building was used in violation of the act. . . . The existence of the nuisance was the ultimate fact in this case, and having been found, supports the judgment"].) This is because "the object of the act is not to punish; its purpose is to effect a reformation of the property itself." (People v. Bayside Land

Co. (1920) 48 Cal.App. 257, 261.)

#### V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NARCOTICS ABATEMENT

[Health and Safety Code Section 11570, et seq. – Defendant and Does 1 Through 50]

- 21. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Complaint and makes them part of the First Cause of Action, as if fully set forth herein.
- 22. From at least 2012 to the present, the Property has been used and is currently being used for the purpose of unlawfully selling, serving, storing, keeping, manufacturing, or giving away controlled substances in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11570, et seq. From 2012 to the present, the narcotics activity at the Property has been continual and ongoing. Between February 2017 and February 2018, LAPD executed six search warrants at the Property on separate dates and recovered narcotics on all six occasions. Prior to executing each of the search warrants, LAPD also successfully conducted one or more controlled "buy" operations, wherein an informant purchased narcotics from dealers at the Property. Altogether, during this one-year period LAPD conducted at least eight controlled buy operations and made at least ten arrests for narcotics sales at the Property. Before this one-year period, LAPD had made arrests for narcotics sales at the Property dating back to at least 2012. The Property's reputation within the community is as a location where narcotics are used and sold.
- 23. Defendant, who owns the Property, and Does 1 through 50 are responsible for conducting, maintaining, and/or directly or indirectly permitting the narcotics-related nuisance as alleged herein. Plaintiff has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law and unless Defendant and Does 1 through 50 are restrained and enjoined by order of this Court, they will continue to use, occupy, and maintain, and/or to aid, abet, or permit, directly or indirectly, the use, occupation, and maintenance of the Property, together with the fixtures and appurtenances located therein, for the nuisance complained of herein, in violation of California law and to the great and irreparable damage of the public.

12

7

15

22

25

#### VI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE

[Civil Code Section 3479, et seq. - Defendant and Does 1 Through 50]

- 24. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 23 of this Complaint and makes them part of this Second Cause of Action, as if fully set forth herein.
- 25. From at least 2012 to the present, the Property has been used or occupied in such a manner as to constitute a public nuisance in violation of Civil Code sections 3479 and 3480. The public nuisance consists of narcotics activity and other criminal incidents that continue to occur on an ongoing basis, including but not limited to: narcotics sales that attract narcotics users and buyers to the Property; the illegal possession of guns and ammunition; and assault with a deadly weapon. Furthermore, either all or almost all of the dealers who have been arrested for selling narcotics at the Property are associates or members of the Hoover Crips criminal street gang. Since at least 2012 to the present, Defendant and Does 1 through 50 have owned, operated, occupied, used, and/or directly or indirectly permitted to be occupied and used, the Property in such a manner that it continues to constitute a public nuisance, given the aforementioned narcotics-related and criminal incidents that continue to occur there. The public nuisance, as described herein, is injurious to health, indecent or offensive to the senses, and/or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to substantially and unreasonably interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property by those persons living in the surrounding community.
- 26. Defendant and Does 1 through 50, in owning, conducting, maintaining, and/or permitting the use of the Property, directly or indirectly, as a public nuisance, have engaged in wrongful conduct and caused a serious threat to the general health, safety, and welfare of the persons in the area surrounding the Property. The public nuisance is ongoing and continual.
- 27. Unless Defendant and Does 1 through 50 are restrained and enjoined by order of this Court, they will continue to use, occupy, and maintain, and to aid, abet, or permit, directly or indirectly, the use, occupation, and maintenance of the Property, together with the fixtures and appurtenances located therein, for the purpose complained of herein, in violation of California law and to the great and irreparable damage of the public.

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF PRAYS THAT THIS COURT ORDER, ADJUDGE, AND DECREE AS FOLLOWS:

#### AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- 1. That Defendant, Does 1 through 50, and the Property, be declared in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11570, *et seq.*
- 2. That the Court order Defendant, as the owner of the Property, to reside at the Property until the nuisance is abated, in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 11573.5.
- 3. That the Property, together with the fixtures and moveable property therein and thereon, be found to constitute a public nuisance and be permanently abated as such in accordance with Section 11581 of the California Health and Safety Code.
- 4. That the Court grant a preliminary injunction, a permanent injunction, and an order of abatement in accordance with Section 11570, et seq., of the California Health and Safety Code, enjoining and restraining Defendant and her agents, officers, employees, transferees, successors-in-interest, and anyone acting on her behalf from unlawfully selling, serving, storing, keeping, manufacturing, or giving away controlled substances at the Property, and/or directly or indirectly maintaining or permitting such nuisance activity.
- 5. That the Court order physical and managerial improvements to the Property in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 11573.5, and issue such orders as are otherwise appropriate, to remedy the nuisance on the Property and enhance the abatement process, including but not limited to, the following: an internet-connected video monitoring system accessible by LAPD; improved lighting; sufficiently secured gating and fencing; the retention of a private management company to oversee the management of the Property; improved tenant screening and lease enforcement procedures; licensed armed security guards; the eviction of all tenants known by Defendant to have engaged in or permitted (1) crimes of violence (excluding domestic violence) as documented in a police report, (2) gang activity, (3) narcotics activity, or (4) the unlawful use or possession of firearms

 at the Property, including upon notification from the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office or LAPD, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code section 47.50 or Civil Code sections 3485 and 3486; and prohibiting known narcotics users and dealers and gang members from accessing the Property.

- 6. That as part of the Judgment, an Order of Abatement be issued, and that the Property be closed for a period of one year, not to be used for any purpose, and be under the control and custody of this Court for said period of time; or, in the alternative, if the Court deems such closure to be unduly harmful to the community, that Defendant and Does 1 through 50 pay an amount of damages equal to the fair market rental value of the Property for one year to the City or County in whose jurisdiction the nuisance is located in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 11581, subdivision (c)(1).
- 7. That Defendant and Does 1 through 50 each be assessed a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000.00).
- 8. That all fixtures and moveable property used in conducting, maintaining, aiding, or abetting the nuisance at the Property be removed by LAPD and sold in the manner provided for the sale of chattels under execution. Said fixtures and property shall be inventoried and a list prepared and filed with this Court.
- 9. That there shall be excepted from said sale such property to which title is established in some third party that is not a defendant or agent, officer, employee, or servant of any defendant in this proceeding.
- 10. That the proceeds from said sale be deposited with this Court for payment of the fees and costs of sale. Such costs may be incurred in closing said property and keeping it closed, removal of said property, and Plaintiff's costs in the Action, including attorneys' fees, and such other costs as the Court shall deem proper.
- 11. That if the proceeds of the sale do not fully discharge all such costs, fees, and allowances, the Property shall also be sold under execution issued upon the order of the Court or judge and the proceeds of such sale shall be applied in a like manner. That any excess monies remaining after payment of approved costs shall be delivered to the owner of said

28 || \ \

property. Ownership shall be established to the satisfaction of this Court.

- 12. That Defendant and Does 1 through 50, and any agents, trustees, officers, employees, and anyone acting on their behalf, and their heirs and assignees, be perpetually enjoined from transferring, conveying, or encumbering any portion of the Property, for consideration or otherwise, without first obtaining the Court's prior approval.
- 13. That Defendant and Does 1 through 50 be ordered to immediately notify any transferees, purchasers, commercial lessees, or other successors-in-interest to the subject Property of any application brought by Plaintiff for any temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, or permanent injunction in this Action or relating to the Property, or the existence of any temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, or permanent injunction issued in this Action or relating to the Property, to all prospective transferees, purchasers, commercial lessees, or other successors-in-interest, *before* entering into any agreement to sell, lease or transfer the Property, for consideration or otherwise, all or any portion of the Property that is the subject of this Action.
- 14. That Defendant and Does 1 through 50 be ordered to immediately give a complete, legible copy of any temporary restraining order and preliminary and permanent injunctions to all prospective transferees, purchasers, lessees, or other successors-in-interest to the Property.
- 15. That Defendant and Does 1 through 50 be ordered to immediately request and procure signatures from all prospective transferees, purchasers, lessees, or other successors-in-interest to the subject Property, which acknowledges his/her respective receipt of a complete, legible copy of any temporary restraining order or preliminary or permanent injunction, and deliver a copy of such acknowledgment to the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office, c/o Deputy City Attorney Rahi Azizi or his designee.
- 16. That Plaintiff recover the costs of this Action, including law enforcement investigative costs and any fees, including attorneys' fees, authorized by law, not to exceed \$1,000,000.00, from Defendant and Does 1 through 50.

II

28 || \ \

- 1. That Defendant, Does 1 through 50, and the Property, be declared in violation of Civil Code section 3479, et seq.
- 2. That the Property, together with the fixtures and moveable property therein and thereon, be declared a public nuisance and be permanently abated as such in accordance with Civil Code section 3491.
- 3. That Defendant and her agents, officers, managers, employees, and anyone acting on her behalf, and her heirs and assignees, be preliminarily and perpetually enjoined from operating, conducting, using, occupying, or in any way permitting the use of the Property as a public nuisance. Such orders should include but not be limited to physical and managerial improvements to the Property and such other orders as are appropriate to remedy the nuisance on the Property and enhance the abatement process.
- Such costs as may occur in abating said nuisance at the Property and such other costs as the Court shall deem just and proper.
- 5. That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper, including closure and/or demolition of the Property.

#### AS TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

1. That Plaintiff recover the amount of the filing fees and the amount of the fee for the service of process or notices which would have been paid but for Government Code section 6103.5, designating it as such. The fees may, at the Court's discretion, include the amount of the fees for certifying and preparing transcripts.

1	2.	That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court deems just an	
2	proper.		
3			
4	DATED:	February 22, 2018	Respectfully submitted,
5			MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney
6			MARY CLARE MOLIDOR, Chief, Crim. & Spec. Lit. Branch JONATHAN CRISTALL, Supervising Assist. City Attorney
7			RAHI AZIZI, Deputy City Attorney
8		a.	Rah
10			By:
11	}		Attorneys for Plaintiff, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
25			
26			
27			
28			
11			